



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

|                          |             |                      |                     |                  |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.          | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/576,730               | 05/04/2009  | Ilan Levin           | LEVIN11A            | 4382             |
| 1444                     | 7590        | 03/15/2011           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Browdy and Neimark, PLLC |             |                      | ROATH, PAUL D       |                  |
| 1625 K Street, N.W.      |             |                      |                     |                  |
| Suite 1100               |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| Washington, DC 20006     |             |                      | 4124                |                  |
|                          |             | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE       |                  |
|                          |             | 03/15/2011           | PAPER               |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |                                     |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/576,730 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>LEVIN ET AL. |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>PAUL ROATH        | <b>Art Unit</b><br>4124             |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-3, 7-9, 13 drawn to an isolated nucleotide sequence responsible for hp-1 phenotype (SEQ ID NO: 1) and a method for detecting the mutation by using said nucleotide sequence.

Group II, claim(s) 4-6 10-12, 13 drawn to an isolated nucleotide sequence responsible for hp-1<sup>w</sup> phenotype (SEQ ID NO: 2) and a method for detecting the mutation by using said nucleotide sequence.

Group III, claim(s) 14-15, drawn to a method for the determination of the presence of two different photomorphogenic mutations in a plant.

Group IV, claim(s) 16-21, drawn to a method for preparing double-mutant lines of L. esculentum.

The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Groups I and II have no shared technical feature because they are drawn to two different nucleotide sequences. Hp-1 and hp-1<sup>w</sup> are alternative alleles for the tomato homolog of the

Arabidopsis thaliana gene encoding UV-damaged DNA binding protein 1 (DDB1). The presence of either mutation is determined separately.

Groups III and IV are drawn to two methods with no feature in common. Group III is drawn to detecting the presence of either hp-1 or hp-1<sup>w</sup> then detecting the presence of a different photomorphogenic mutation. Group IV is drawn to preparing Lycopersicon esculentum plant lines with double mutations. The mutations are either hp-1 or hp-1w and any other recessive photomorphogenic lycopene-enhancing mutation that is genetically unlinked to the hp-1/hp-1w mutation.

The technical feature linking Groups I-IV is an hp-1 mutation. This hp-1 mutation leads to an increased pigmentation resulting in deeper red fruit and darker green leaves as compared to wild type. However, commercial breeding programs have introduced hp-1 into tomato cultivars to enhance fruit color and nutritional quality of tomatoes. Thus, there is a lack of an inventive step to isolate the various hp-1 mutants to produce increased lycopene (nutritional value) and deeper red colored fruits. Liu et al. demonstrated that hp-1 alleles are mutations in the DDB1 tomato homolog. Liu et al. PNAS 101(26): 9897-9902. Peters et al. demonstrated that hp-1 mutants play a general repressive role in phytochrome signal transduction thus providing an explanation for the increased anthocyanin content of tomatoes. Peters et al. Plant Physiol. 117: 797-807. Therefore the technical feature linking the inventions of Groups I-IV does not constitute a special feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2 as it does not define a contribution over the prior art.

Accordingly, Groups I-IV are not linked by the same or corresponding special technical feature as to form a single inventive concept.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof. Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result**

**in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL ROATH whose telephone number is (571)270-1008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anne-Marie Grunberg can be reached on 571-272-0975. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paul Roath/  
Examiner Art Unit 1638

/Anne Marie Grunberg/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1638